

they got out of line, the policeman would have died for nothing.

The policeman died trying to secure the fair opportunity to vote. Yet, nowadays, that is being belittled: We shouldn't even utilize voter IDs. You shouldn't have to have an ID.

Well, that is the best way to ensure that there is not fraud in the election, just like it is the best way to ensure that someone is not illegally getting a gun or getting a cigarette or getting alcohol. People produce those all the time. Let's quit disenfranchising so many people that are voting lawfully by creating the ability to have people vote illegally.

We keep hearing about: Oh, gee, that is not true. We need to censor people and not allow them to speak or submit things online if they are not in conformance with what the liberal Democrat high-tech industry or the liberal Democrat media say is true or not true.

We listened to 4 years of lies about the Russian dossier when it was produced by a former MI6 agent in England, who even admitted: Yes, my sources, they could have been working for Putin.

It was a manipulation paid for by the Hillary Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee. The FBI was in cahoots and, in fact, even lied to the FISA court.

It really got my attention, having been a judge, to see that FISA court judges had so little regard for their own status, their own courts, that they would not take action to hold in contempt people who held the court in contempt by lying, by defrauding the court, in order to spy on a Presidential political campaign. My goodness, there has never been a Presidential campaign treated as the Trump campaign was.

□ 1315

It even had a Democrat official on tape admitting: We are the ones who paid for violence to get started at Trump campaign events so that we could claim that Trump was stirring up violence.

That was in 2016.

For heaven's sake, we needed a Justice Department that would be just, and we don't have it right now. For heaven's sake, I heard from a constituent 2 days ago who that day was shocked to have two FBI agents show up at her place of work in east Texas. She had not come to Washington on January 6. She was at work in east Texas.

The only reason those FBI agents could have showed up at her place of work was because her nephew texted her a picture of someone who was here on January 6 in Washington and asked: Do you see anybody you recognize? Because it looked like his aunt.

She said: Wow, I thought that was me.

Then jokingly she said: Don't turn me in.

Unless the FBI were monitoring these text messages which was either

by the grant of a warrant from a FISA court that, in my opinion, was breaking the PATRIOT Act and was breaking the law to grant such a warrant, or they were committing a crime and spying on people's text messages without authority.

This is getting out of control here. Of course, we don't hear any stories about the people who were looting and creating insurrections in cities around America last summer. We don't hear about them being arrested or having their homes wrongfully broken into by police or Federal officials. No. But we are hearing about it, and the illegality and the brownshirt tactics of the Federal Government needs to stop.

Mr. HOYER says he was shocked 8 months was all somebody got for disrupting an official proceeding. Well, that also happened on June 22, 2016 for 26 hours on this floor, and I am surprised that Mr. HOYER wants to see his fellow Democrats going to prison for more than 8 months for obstructing an official proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

ABOLISHING THE FILIBUSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I rise today to recognize the more than 50 Texas Democrats, State representatives, who have taken a stand for liberty and justice for all and who have traversed thousands of miles in the name of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I rise to commend and defend those who are making great sacrifices to protect free and fair elections. They have left their homes, they have left Texas, and they have come all the way to Washington, D.C. They have left their families.

Can you imagine having to leave your home and your family on short notice?

This is not something that they planned. This is not something that they had time to think through and to give all of the deliberations and considerations that one might give to leaving home for some extended period of time, and to be quite candid, not to know exactly how long they will be gone from home, some unknown extended period of time. They have left their homes, and they have left their families. They have left their children.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, simply saying to your child that you have a duty to perform, an unexpected duty, not something that you wanted to do, but something that you know that you

must do in the name of government of the people, by the people, and for the people and in the name of liberty and justice for all?

Leaving their children and coming to Washington, D.C., some of them had to leave jobs. The Texas legislature doesn't pay a huge sum of money to go to serve, some \$600 per month.

So they have left their homes, their families, and their jobs to come to Washington, D.C., not to have a vacation and not to have time to simply socialize and enjoy themselves, they have come to Washington, D.C., because they want to have those of us who have the ability to impact free and fair elections with H.R. 1, the For the People Act, to impact the ability to make sure that elections are properly protected and that the persons who are going to vote have equal access to the polls. They want us to pass H.R. 4, once we file it again, the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, one that would advance voting rights, I might add.

So they have come here to appeal to us to protect liberty and justice for all when it comes to voting, to protect government of the people, by the people, and for the people because it is the vote that accords us this opportunity to govern in a fashion that Lincoln called to our attention in the Gettysburg Address.

They have come to Washington, D.C., to the citadel of democracy in the United States of America, and they are prepared to stay as long as it takes so that they may do what many people would admire them for doing but not everyone would do.

They are here to break the quorum so that the Texas Statehouse cannot pass laws that are invidiously discriminating. Invidious discrimination is a term that I like very much because it means harmful discrimination. Not all discrimination is harmful. But they are here to fight against invidious discrimination, and they come here asking us to take a stand with them. They are breaking a quorum.

Now, there are those who contend that what they are doing is what we are contending that the Senate should not do. Not true. That is not true. They are breaking a quorum. They are preventing the Statehouse in Texas from going forward, and they are doing it with a rule that requires at least two-thirds to be present for business to be lawfully conducted. Well, here in Washington, D.C., we have a filibuster rule.

A filibuster means very simply this: one Member can decide that he or she would not have legislation go forward. Once that decision has been made by one Member, Mr. Speaker, you can only break that filibuster with something called cloture, meaning you now have to get 60 votes before you can pass legislation with 51 votes assuming all Senators are present and voting.

This rule, the filibuster rule, is something that is not necessary. It is something that has been employed by segregationists. It is a favorite tool of

those who have discriminated against us when it comes to civil rights and human dignity in this country.

As an example, Southern segregationist Democrats—that is right, I said Democrats—unified in opposition to civil rights regularly employed the filibuster and prevented cloture. They successfully employed the filibuster to thwart all nearly 200 anti-lynching measures. They prevented a vote on several substantial civil rights bills.

Senator Strom Thurmond in 1957 took on a civil rights bill for 24 hours to filibuster. Former Senator Richard Russell was a leading filibuster. Senator Russell was an outspoken opponent of civil rights legislation. In 1935 he and his colleagues in the Senate stopped an anti-lynching bill with 6 days of nonstop talking. In 1964, he filibustered for 60 working days in the Senate opposing civil rights legislation. Later, in 1964, Russell and more than a dozen other Senators boycotted the Democratic National Convention simply because President Lyndon Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act into law.

So this filibuster rule is a rule that I find no favor with. It is a rule that has haunted those of us who seek equality and justice in this country for everyone. The filibuster rule is not something that is necessary, but that is what the Senate can employ. So if there is an equivalent of the filibuster rule in the Senate as it relates to the Texas house, then I might not have a problem with it.

But, Mr. Speaker, here is the problem: in the Senate, to avoid having the necessary number to pass legislation, constitutionally, you have to have 51 votes. You have to “break” the ability to pass votes with 51. So if the Senate in this United States Capitol would do what those who have come here from Texas would do, then we would have to have them bring 51 people away from the floor to prevent the number necessary to have a quorum. They would have to break a quorum. They don’t have to break a quorum now. They but only have to indicate they would like to filibuster, and, in so doing, we would have to in the Senate here in Washington, D.C., get 60 votes before we can vote to pass something with 51 votes.

I believe that we ought to eliminate the filibuster. I think then if the Senate would want to do what these brave Texas Democrats have done, then they would have to break the quorum by having 51 people stay away from the Senate floor. Right now, they don’t have to have anyone stay away from the Senate floor. It is easy to do what they have done. The Texas Democrats have done something courageous because they have come all the way to Washington, D.C. More than 50 people have aligned themselves so that they can provide a means by which we will have the opportunity to pass civil rights legislation here—H.R. 1, the For the People Act; and H.R. 4 once it is filed again, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

My hope is that we can pass both of these pieces of legislation. My hope is that at some point we will eliminate the filibuster. There are those who would say: If you eliminate the filibuster, at some point it will come back to haunt you because the laws that you pass to eliminate it, others can pass laws to reinstate whatever you have eliminated.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if you pass good laws, it would be very difficult to turn them over simply on a whim. I believe that a good example of this is the law that we passed to accord healthcare to people who didn’t have it in this country, ObamaCare as it is called, but more technically speaking, it is the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act has afforded people the opportunity to have good insurance.

Prior to the Affordable Care Act there were people who thought they had good insurance. They paid their premiums timely. They thought they had good insurance until they had to use it, and it was at this point that they found out just how good their insurance was or how poorly they had decided to buy policies that were what were called junk insurance. They didn’t know because they didn’t need it, and they were paying something that they thought was reasonable for what they thought was coverage that did not exist.

When we passed the law that allowed for persons to have good insurance, the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, when we passed this law, we then put ourselves in a position such that it could be challenged, and for years it has been challenged. For years there have been efforts to overturn it. For years persons have said: We will repeal and replace.

They never ever considered what the replacement would be going forward with the repeal. To this day the Affordable Care Act still stands.

Mr. Speaker, if you pass good legislation, then you don’t have to concern yourself with the ability of others on a whim to simply overturn it because they don’t like it, because it somehow has given people opportunities that perhaps they didn’t foresee or believe were appropriate. The Affordable Care Act is good legislation, and as a result many people have had the opportunity to have healthcare that they ordinarily would not have.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should eliminate the filibuster as we have it here. I believe we should resort to what the State of Texas has, which is a requirement that you have X number of senators present to make a quorum. It is the quorum that the representatives from Texas have challenged. In Washington, D.C., it is a filibuster that one person can call to the attention of the Senate and use to thwart legislation.

If we go to a quorum here in Washington, D.C., then let the Senators

come up with 51 people who will not show up so that they can prevent legislation from going forward. That would be the equivalent of what is happening in the State of Texas. A quorum is being challenged. There is no filibuster that is being challenged. It is a quorum.

I congratulate them and salute them and commend them for challenging this quorum, to prevent laws from being passed that will thwart the efforts of people to vote who sometimes don’t have the opportunity to vote that I might have, that many of us would have here.

I see nothing wrong with having the ability to vote 24 hours a day. Apparently, some in the State of Texas do. I remember when we had that opportunity in Texas. In this legislation, as being proposed, it would be eliminated. I went out to the polls at midnight, and I greeted people who were coming to vote. I saw people who were leaving work; people who found it beneficial to have the opportunity to come to the polling place at midnight and cast their votes because they are hard-working people, and they sleep during hours that others of us are awake.

I thought it was a wonderful thing to see this voting for 24 hours a day. It is a wonderful thing to know that people can have the opportunity to do this and go right home after work. Not everybody gets off from work at 5 o’clock. Many people don’t get off from work until 11 or 12 o’clock. So this opportunity to vote for 24 hours a day was something very beneficial to a good many of my constituents in the State of Texas.

Unfortunately, it was not something that others approved of and said that they disapprove of it because it wasn’t something that was being done prior to COVID. There are people who said it was never done at any place in the country before. Since when do we decide that we will not do things because they have never been done before? If we decide that we will only do things that have been done before, where will we have the opportunity to make progress? How can you move forward if you decide that you are going to stagnate yourself?

We haven’t always had electronic ballots. We can still vote with paper ballots if we choose, but we have chosen to move forward. We haven’t always had Sunday voting, but we now vote on Sundays. We haven’t always had 24-hour voting, and I contend we ought to have the opportunity to do this now.

Mr. Speaker, I contend to my dear friends that it is our duty and responsibility to make it easier for people to vote. This is what the State of Texas says that it is doing, it is making it easier for people to vote. How are you making it easier if you are going to limit the times that people can vote? How are you making it easier if you make it harder for people to vote by mail? How are you making it easier if

you don't have the boxes so that people can simply drop—safe and secure, by the way—safely and securely drop their ballots off in various places around the county? You are not making it easier. You are making it more difficult under the guise of making it easier.

So I contend that these Democrats who have traversed this great distance, who have come to Washington, D.C. as a means of showing the world that there are still people who will take a stand for liberty and justice for all, for government of the people, by the people, for the people, and protect the right to vote. They are defenders of the democracy when they do this, because the very seat of democracy, the very thing that democracy resides upon is the notion of having a free and fair election. You can't have a free and fair election if you don't have equal access to the polls.

You can't have a free and fair election if you don't have the opportunity to register and vote without certain impediments to your registering to vote. That would create a poll tax. Let me explain.

I went to the polls in Texas to test the system that was in place. I tried to vote with my congressional ID card, the card that I can use to vote on issues related to the budget of the United States of America; the card that I can use to vote on issues related to war and peace. I could not vote with it. I tested the system. I did have the proper credentials, but I wanted to test the system.

The system required me, if I am going to acquire the ID in Texas to vote, it required me to get my birth certificate. If you live in Texas, you can get this ID at no cost. But I was born in Louisiana. I live there, but I was born in Louisiana. Persons who were born in Texas, you can get the ID at no cost. I applied for my ID in Louisiana.

There were some complications with my birth certificate. To this day, I have not received the ID that I applied for; and that was years ago. The point is this: If we are going to have an ID card and contend that it is free to persons who cannot afford the cost of an ID card, we have to make sure that it is free for persons who are not born in Texas who don't have access to birth certificates, who will have to send out of State.

In this country, we don't conclude that you should pay a fee to vote, even if that fee is to get a birth certificate. I contend that this is a way of having a new form of a poll tax. Knowing that college students in the State of Texas who want to vote in the State of Texas to get a proper ID to vote, if it is going to be a State ID or an ID that they don't have for Texas purposes, they will have to get some form of birth certificate or proof of birth in the State of Texas or in this country. They have to present this.

They know that college students can't present it if they were from Cali-

fornia and they are in Texas and they have a California identification that does not necessarily require the birth certificate, then they don't accept this. There is a list of the things that can be accepted, and college student IDs have been excluded from the list.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today saluting them for what they have done, understanding that they are doing all that they can to make a difference, and understanding that they are appealing to us, the Members of this House, to help them, to be a part of their effort to get H.R. 1 and H.R. 4 passed here so as to prevent those in Texas who would thwart the rights of persons to vote from being able to do so if we can pass some of our legislation.

One piece of legislation, H.R. 4, is exceedingly important, because H.R. 4 will bring back the opportunity for people in the State of Texas to challenge changes in laws without a preclearance by the Justice Department or a Federal court that might be here in Washington, D.C.

H.R. 4 would restore the Voting Rights Act that was eviscerated when section 4 of the Voting Rights Act was found unconstitutional. When it was eliminated, eviscerated, if you will, it emasculated section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Section 4 was the coverage area, so that section 5 could then require these other things that would help persons who are trying to prevent States like Texas from doing things that were egregious as it relates to the right to vote.

Section 4 would be restored, and as a result, we would again have coverage for States like Texas, States like Texas in Harris County where I live, that had White primaries. The State of Texas had these White primaries and a man named Lonnie Smith took the State of Texas all the way to the Supreme Court to challenge White primaries. The White primaries were set aside. The Supreme Court said: You can't do that.

Well, in an adjoining county, there were White pre primaries. The State of Texas has been a bad actor for a long time. These persons who have come here, these noble freedom fighters have come here to solicit our support and our help. And I hope that the United States Senate will at some point eliminate the filibuster. But if not, I trust that there will be 60 persons who will help us get to cloture so that we can take up H.R. 1 and H.R. 4, laws that will help us restore the right to vote for all of Americans without these impediments that are being imposed in States across the country.

To honor them, we have a resolution that we are filing. This resolution is going to honor them for what they have done in coming to Washington, D.C. It will honor them for the stand that they have taken. This resolution will be signed by the members of the Texas Democratic delegation and filed with the House of Representatives.

We also are sending a letter to the President of the United States, a sec-

ond letter, asking the President to please meet with them, not in person, but meet with them virtually. Meet with them and hear their hue and their cry, their appeal for help. I am sure the President understands the issue, so it is not about convincing the President. It is about letting them have the opportunity to speak and letting the President know that they stand firm on the grounds of providing liberty and justice for all, government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Finally, I am here this afternoon, because I believe that we all have to be accountable for what we do. I believe that we all have to, at some point, answer for the positions that we have or have not taken. I am here representing not only myself but other Democrats who could not be here. They are persons who support what we are doing. They are persons who are members of the Texas Democratic delegation.

They have demonstrated that they are standing in solidarity with the members from Texas who are here representing those in Texas who believe that there should not be these laws passed to thwart the efforts to vote. But the members of the Texas Democratic delegation are standing absolutely, totally, and completely in solidarity with the Texas State representatives who are here. And my hope is, that as we stand in solidarity with them, we will at some point achieve our goal. Our goal is simply this: to make sure that in Texas we have free and fair elections.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JERRY LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to our esteemed former colleague, Jerry Lewis, the longest-serving California Republican in the history of the House, who on a personal level, was my good friend and mentor.

On July 15, Jerry passed from this life into the next. For the last 86 years, Jerry lived a full life. He made an extraordinary impact throughout the Inland Empire community he loved so dearly, leaving it in a far better position than when his decades of public service began.

When I was first elected to this body in November of 1992, Jerry was one of